DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 939 CG 019 748

AUTHOR Chinen, Merton; And Others
TITLE Pre-Commitment Factors of Juveniles Incarcerated at the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility--A Study of the 1974-1978 Population. Report NO. 323.
INSTITUTION Hawaii Univ., Manoa. Youth Development & Research Center.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 60p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; Age Differences; *Correctional Institutions; Criminals; *Delinquency; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; Followup Studies; Juvenile Courts; *Mental Health Programs; Probationary Period; *Recidivism; Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Hawaii

ABSTRACT

"Recidivism of Discharges from the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility--1974 to 1978" (Zych, 1984) was a research project which examined characteristics of the recidivist as a juvenile, such as sex, commitment offense, and age at commitment. A study was undertaken to supplement that research project by examining additional variables influencing recidivism of the juvenile offender. These variables included age at first referral to Family Court, agency placements used prior to commitment, the length of time spent on probation, whether or not the juvenile had been detained in the detention home prior to commitment, and the severity of a juvenile's criminal history. Subjects were 325 juveniles who were incarcerated at the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility (HYCF) and who represented a sample of the 570 juveniles studied in the previous research project. The data on variables studied were cross-tabulated with post-HYCF recidivism behavior. The sample was examined at two levels of recidivism--arrest and conviction. The results indicated only one significant relationship between the variables and recidivism: a juvenile's placement in a mental health program displayed a high rate of recidivism by conviction. A possible explanation for this finding may stem from the fact that juveniles placed in mental health programs have been perceived to have a higher degree of mental dysfunction or sociopathic behavior, therefore having higher chances of violating the law again. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED279939

PRE-COMMITMENT FACTORS OF JUVENILES INCARCERATED AT THE HAWAII YOUTH CORRECTIONAL FACILITY - A STUDY OF THE 1974-1978 POPULATION

CG 019748

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M.J. Manos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT & RESEARCH CENTER

March 1986
Report No. 323

PRE-COMMITMENT FACTORS OF JUVENILES INCARCERATED AT THE HAWAII YOUTH CORRECTIONAL FACILITY - A STUDY OF THE 1974-1978 POPULATION

By

Merton Chinen
Myron Seu
Eric Tanaka

Direction and Supervision By

Youth Development and Research Center
School of Social Work
University of Hawaii-Manoa

Jack T. Nagoshi, Director
Keith Y. Kameoka, Educational Specialist
Joyce H. Tanji, Educational Specialist
Meda Chesney-Lind, Researcher

March 1986

Report No. 323

ABSTRACT

This study collected pre-incarceration variables on 325 juveniles who were incarcerated at the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility (HYCF). The subjects represented a sample of a larger population of 570 juveniles who were the focus of an earlier study which examined similar variable-recidivism relationships. The data on the variables of this study were cross-tabulated with post-HYCF recidivism behavior. The results indicate only one significant relationship between the various variables and recidivism, placement in a mental health program was related to recidivism by conviction. Possible explanations of the results are discussed and recommendations for further research in this area are explored.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank Mary Jane Lee for allowing us the opportunity to gain access into the records at Family Court. Without her initial approval this endeavor could not have been accomplished.

Much gratuity goes out to Norman Fujioka, Coordinator for Volunteers in Public Service, and his aide Charlene Tone, for their assistance in helping us secure temporary parking passes. Their services were looked upon with much relief and convenience.

We would also like to thank Dorothy Kawamoto and Dorothy Kau, of Family Court Statistics and Records Division, respectively, for their time and efforts in facilitating the data collection process. Their patience in orienting and educating us on the Family Court system and records made for efficient tabulations.

This research group is very grateful to Jack Nagoshi, YDRC Director, for his supreme guidance in assisting us in getting this research project off the ground. His support and supervision, which was greatly needed, could be felt throughout this educational process.

Thanks also goes out to Joyce Tanji, Educational Specialist, who helped in constructing and modifying our data collection instrument.

We are also indebted to Meda Chesney-Lind, Researcher, whose input and consultation was helpful.

Appreciation especially goes out to our fearless leader, Keith Kameoka, Educational Specialist, whose guidance and support

was needed and sought. His patience, humor, and perseverence, through all the commotion, did not go unnoticed by us.

The industrious work of Stuart Nakamoto, Computer Programmer, whose competence made this a successful undertaking, must also be mentioned.

Lastly, we would like to thank Lanette Yoshioka, YDRC Secretary, and her aide, Ellen Chung, for their cheery and positive demeanor. Their support and consideration (and food), not to mention their diligence, made for a rather smooth learning process.

Again, thank you to all involved for your cooperation, time, and understanding in making this experience a somewhat enjoyable and unforgettable one.

Merton Chinen
Myron Seu
Eric Tanaka

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	i
Acknowledgement	ii
List of Tables	v
Introduction	1
Review of Literature	2
Research Questions	7
Method and Procedure	8
Subjects	8
Procedure	9
Limitations/Problems	9
Results	11
Demographic Comparison of 1984 Population With Current Sub-Population	11
Residential Placement	18
Educational Placement	20
Mental Health Placement	22
Extension Placement	24
Other Placement	25
Top Five Placement Referrals	27
Placements in Detention Home Prior to HYCF Incarceration	28
Offense Severity	30
Discussion	34
Limitations/Problems	36
Implications	36
References	38

Appendix A: Data Collection Instrument
Appendix B: Code Sheets

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Demographic Comparison - Age	12
2	Demographic Comparison - Sex	12
3	Demographic Comparsion - Race	13
4	Arrest Recidivism by Grouped Age	14
5	Conviction Recidivism by Grouped Age	14
6	Arrest Recidivism by Total Number of Placements	16
7	Conviction Recidivism by Total Number of Placements	16
8	Arrest Recidivism by Residential Placement . . .	19
9	Conviction Recidivism by Residential Placement	20
10	Arrest Recidivism by Educational Placement . . .	21
11	Conviction Recidivism by Educational Placement	22
12	Arrest Recidivism by Mental Health Placement . .	23
13	Conviction Recidivism by Mental Health Placement	23
14	Arrest Recidivism by Extension Placement	24
15	Conviction Recidivism by Extension Placement	25
16	Arrest Recidivism by Other Placements	26
17	Conviction Recidivism by Other Placements . . .	26
18	Arrest Recidivism by Top Five Placement Referrals	27
19	Conviction Recidivism by Top Five Placement Referrals	28
20	Arrest Recidivism by Placement in Detention Home Prior to HYCF	29

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Table		Page
21	Conviction Recidivism by Placement in Detention Home Prior to HYCF	30
22(a-e)	Offense Severity Prior to Entry HYCF by Arrest Recidivism	31
23(a-e)	Offense Severity Prior to Entry HYCF by Conviction Recidivism	32

INTRODUCTION

This study has been undertaken to supplement a previously completed research project, Recidivism of Discharges From the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility - 1974 to 1978 (Zych, 1984). The sampled population involved 325 of the original 570 juveniles who had been incarcerated in the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility (HYCF). Similar to the earlier research, this study examined characteristics of the recidivist as a juvenile. Several variables influencing recidivism such as sex, commitment offense and age at commitment had been previously explored, this project attempted to investigate additional variables influencing recidivism of the juvenile offender. Additional variables such as age at first referral to Family Court, agency placements utilized prior to commitment in HYCF, the length of time spent on probation, whether or not the juvenile had been detained in the detention home prior to commitment in HYCF, and the severity of a juveniles criminal history (i.e., Felony A, B, C, Misdemeanor, or Petty Misdemeanor) were investigated.

A minor's age at first referral to the Family Court has been considered a vital variable influencing recidivism. It has been speculated that the lower the juvenile's age at first contact with the criminal justice system, the greater the risk of recidivism. It was also assumed that the type of agency placements utilized by the Court prior to a juveniles' commitment to HYCF will contribute to recidivism in the sample. Also questioned is

whether or not the detainment in the detention home will contribute to future recidivism. Finally, it had been postulated that the more severe a juvenile's criminal history, the greater the likelihood of recidivism.

Review of Literature - Pertinent Variables

Age

Research conducted has shown that age (i.e., age at first arrest and age of conviction) has been an important variable in predicting recidivism. Hernandez and Sakamoto (1982) found that younger offenders under age 25 are more prone to recidivate than those offenders who are older. Barthell and Winfree (1977) claimed that age has been the best predictor for subsequent convictions of any crime whether a felony or misdemeanor. LeClair (1976) observed similar findings in his study of those on parole in Massachusetts. He concluded that age at first arrest (age 17 or younger), and age at present incarceration (age 18 or younger) are statistically significant in predicting future rates of recidivism.

In separate studies conducted by Wood (1977) and Tangonan (1977), of probationers in Hawaii, age at first arrest had also been observed to be related to high rates of recidivism. Wood added that age (18 or younger) has been a significant predictor of recidivism along with fewer changes in residence and employment. Tangonan reported that those who recidivated are more likely between the ages 18 to 25.

Criminal History

Some researchers are convinced that the probability of recidivism centers on the criminal history (i.e., prior arrests and convictions) of an individual. In their findings, Stott and Wilson (1977) claimed that, "The most reliable predictor of crime is previous crime." LeClair (1976) has found several significant variables distinguishing recidivists from non-recidivists. In his study of Massachusetts parolees, he concluded that the individual's criminal career pattern had been the strongest indicator of recidivism. The conclusion of Mitchel and Rosa's (1981) fifteen-year follow-up study of school-aged children claimed that students who have deviated socially are significantly more likely to become offenders and recidivists. Further evidence had been reported by Nassi (1978), when examining statistics calculated by the Federal Prison System, he found that 66% of persons in Federal Institutions had prior commitments while 83% had prior convictions.

Research done locally has produced similar findings. Keala (1974), reported that of 513 adults arrested in Honolulu in 1974, 400 or 78% had criminal histories. Reinforcing these findings, Hernandez and Sakamoto's (1982) study revealed that many had histories of prior contact with the Justice System as juveniles and adults.

Types of Crimes

The type of crime for which an offender is sentenced has been frequently used to predict recidivism. Heilburm, Knopf and Bruner (1976) cited studies which have indicated that parolees serving sentences for crimes against persons are less likely to recidivate

than those serving sentences for property offenses. LeClair (1976), concluded in his study that a lower risk of recidivism existed for those serving time for manslaughter, rape or murder than drug offenders, property offenders and escapees. Such findings are supported by Hernandez and Sakamoto (1982) in noting that a great proportion of those adults placed on probation in Hawaii are convicted of property offenses.

Placements

Despite a spreading "get-tough" attitude toward juvenile offenders, chances are now better than in the past that juveniles would not end up in HYCF. This is because most juveniles guilty of offenses are being placed into a wide array of social service programs in their own community. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as ammended in 1977 (P.L. 95-115), has provided funds and leadership to promote such alternatives to incarceration. Some states have shown that the use of community based programs has proved to be fairly successful and relatively inexpensive (Nelson, 1977). Lewis (1979) found that for the state of Massachusetts the implementation of community based programs for offenders had reduced recidivism rates by 50%. Menard and Covey (1983) supported Lewis's findings and added that such programs do not increase the offenders risk of recidivism. Miller (1972) found that the risk of making the juvenile offender worse off by utilizing placements in the community appears to be minimal since incarceration has had such a poor record of rehabilitating youths who have been incarcerated.

Yet Martin and Snyder (1976) have argued that society may be worse off by utilizing community based agencies. Waldo, Chiricos,

& Dobrin (1972) note that community based programs have not been more effective than institutions in reducing recidivism. They speculated that the failure of programs to produce change in the offender may be due to the perception of fear and contempt felt for prison inmates in the outside community along with other experiences of social rejection. They concluded that the stigma attached to the offender may arouse as much community hostility as the crime did. The findings in a report conducted by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (1977), assessing the impact of community placement of juvenile offenders in ten states, indicate that some states agree that certain juveniles are less troublesome to society in the short-run if incarcerated. In the long-run however, most states agree that society's best interests are served by utilizing community based programs for all offenders. The report adds that the harmful effects of incarceration eventually surface in the form of higher rates of recidivism and that these higher rates affect everyone in the community.

Whatever the case, it has been information such as the above that complicate the literature when looking at the benefits of community based programs for the juvenile offender.

Detention Home

For offenders who have committed no crime, detainment in the detention home may expose the first time offender to the behaviors of young hardened criminal offenders. The administrator of the Detention Home reported, "...the role of the detention home has been a dilemma; ...primarily it is a detainment facility and is

not set up for the long term, however it has been used as both... because of the lack of other shelters, there has been a dangerous mix of teenage criminals and other offenders such as runaways, truants, curfew violators" (Ling, 1981).

Mahoney (1974) describes juveniles detained in detention homes as "...unhappy about being removed from home and having a low self-image, they often learn the methods and attitude of those hardened young criminals of whom they are detained with." This seems to suggest that for the first time offender, detainment in the detention home may contribute to future rates of recidivism.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions were formulated to investigate any possible relationships existing between various variables and recidivism behaviors. All of the variables focused on in this study revealed data on some aspect of the juveniles' history up to the HYCF commitment. Although the variables displayed different pieces of information that may or may not have had a relationship with the recidivism data, the fact remains that every juvenile in this study and Zych's (1984) project was incarcerated at the HYCF for some period. The effect of the incarceration experience at HYCF thus becomes a factor influencing the variable-recidivism relationships. Since the known effect of the incarceration experience on the juvenile's subsequent recidivism behavior cannot be determined for this study, caution should be exercised in analyzing and interpreting the data gathered in attempting to answer the research questions.

1. Is the age at first referral to the Family Court related to increased recidivism?
2. Is the total number of placements related to recidivism?
3. Are the types of placements related to recidivism?
4. Does the top five placements (highest frequency placements) utilized prior to HYCF relate to recidivism?
5. Does detainment in the Detention Home relate to future recidivism?
6. Does pre-HYCF criminal history relate to post-HYCF criminal activity (recidivism)?

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

This study was a continuation of a previously undertaken project (Zych, 1984) of incarcerated and discharged/paroled juvenile offenders from the Hawaii Youth Correctional Facility (HYCF), Corrections Division, Department of Social Services and Housing. Though focusing on different variables than that of the earlier study the main concern encompassed whether or not there were certain characteristics which might indicate a higher tendency for certain type(s) of individuals to recidivate. Pre-HYCF incarceration variables were the focus of the study.

Subjects

The subjects were 305 juvenile offenders between the ages of 12 to 18 who were incarcerated and discharged/paroled from HYCF between 1974 to 1978. It was discovered that the original population of 570 subjects, which was used in the 1984 study, could not be utilized because of unforeseen circumstances. This was due to the fact that the present study was conducted 7 to 11 years after the original 1974 to 1978 period, a length of time in which many of the Family Court files had been destroyed. It was learned that Family Court policy dictated that upon reaching 25 years of age, said juvenile records (224) would be, and were, systematically destroyed. Furthermore, 41 of the remaining 346 files still in existence could not be utilized because of insufficient information. It was revealed that of the 41 files in question, 1 had been lost, 1 was a courtesy supervision from the mainland (original file located in Topeka, Kansas), and the remaining 39 files were

courtesy supervision cases from the counties of Maui, Hawaii, and Kauai (original files still located in their respective counties). Retrieval of courtesy supervision files were deemed unfeasible and thus not pursued.

Procedure

The files of Family Court, First Circuit, The Judiciary, State of Hawaii, were examined for factual, documented data. After having sifted through a sampling of the juvenile records, a data gathering instrument was developed to extract pertinent information from the remaining 305 files (see Appendix A).

Variables include: 1) age at first Family Court referral, 2) placements prior to first incarceration - if yes, what were the last 3 placements, 3) was four or more such placements used, 4) total number of months and times on juvenile probation, 5) placement in Detention Home (DH) prior to first incarceration, 6) total number of offenses committed throughout the juvenile's delinquent career, 7) last 5 specific offenses commited prior to first incarceration, and 8) the total number of times the youngster was incarcerated at HYCF. Data collected on the previous stated variables were merged with data from the earlier study.

Limitations/Problems

Data available at Family Court were relatively consistent and readily attainable. However, concerns were raised in regard to the arbitrariness and lack of uniformity in the way the individual probation officers compiled each juvenile's social summary. Lack of systemization hindered data collection.

The task of locating DH placement(s) was often caught up in the wordiness of the social summary. Because of the length and nonconformity of the social summary's structure, a yes/no type question was utilized in determining DH placement, as opposed to counting the total placements. Likewise, agency placement information also posed a problem because of its intermittent locale throughout the social summary and thus, a yes/no question was also created. Further problems arose because of the haziness of whether an individual actually was placed at an agency as opposed to just being referred but not placed. Lack of continuity in this regard and inconsistently labeling the placement agency, coupled with the amount of placements and the length of the probation officer's summary, made data collection difficult.

RESULTS

Unlike the original study of 1984, which approached recidivism from three levels - arrest, conviction, and incarceration, the current endeavor differed by excluding recidivism at the incarceration level. Early intentions were to include all aspects of recidivism. However, it was learned that the previous 1984 incarceration data was inaccessible from the computer's data bank during the retrieval process.

Before further discussion is made in regard to Tables 1, 2, and 3, it must be mentioned that of the current sample of 325, one subject's age, sex, and race could not be paired with the various demographic groups, respectively (n=324).

Demographic Comparison of 1984 Population With Current Sub-Population

An attempt to describe and define the current sub-population with that of the 1984 population proved to be relevant and somewhat consistent. This was done by contrasting the demographic data (refer to Tables 1, 2, and 3), age, sex, and race of both samples in consideration. In viewing Table 1, age, it can be noted that the difference in percentage points between populations, along all age brackets, differed by 1.0% (age 14) to a high of 5.4% (17-18 age group). For sex, the variation between populations ranged from 1.5% among both the male and female samples. Lastly, in contrasting the demographic data of race, the differences in percentage points among the two populations diversified from 4.6% (Hawaiian-Part Hawaiian) to .1% (Filipino). In surveying all

three tables in question there does not seem to be a great disparity (in percentage points) between the population and sample.

Table 1

AGE

	Current Sample		1984 Population
Age	n size	%	%
12-13	31	9.6	7.5
14	61	18.8	17.0
15	96	29.6	26.5
16	81	25.0	26.5
17-18	55	17.0	22.4
Missing	1	.3	-

Table 2

SEX

	Current Sample		1984 Population
Sex	n size	%	%
Male	259	79.9	81.4
Female	65	20.1	18.6
Missing	1	.3	-

Table 3

RACE

Race	Current Sample n size	Current Sample %	1984 Population %
Hawaiian-Part Hawaiian	150	46.3	50.9
Samoan	17	5.2	4.0
Caucasian	26	8.0	7.5
Portuguese	6	1.9	2.6
Filipino	23	7.1	7.0
Asian	17	5.2	4.9
Puerto Rican/Black	8	2.5	3.0
Other	8	2.5	2.8
Mixed	69	21.3	18.6
Missing	1	.3	-

Of the total of 325 individuals, 154 or 47.4% were first referred to the Family Court between the ages 7-13 and 52.0% (n=169) were first referred between the ages of 14-17 (see Table 4). The age of first referral for two juveniles could not be determined. Seventy-four percent (74%) (n=114) of the juveniles in the 7-13 age category recidivated by arrest while 26% (n=40) did not. For the juveniles between the ages 14-17, 72.8% (n=123) recidivated by arrest and 27.2% (n=46) had no recidivism-arrests. The highest recidivism rate was displayed for the 7-13 age group category, 74% (n=114). The table suggests that juveniles who were first referred to the Family Court between the ages 7-13 were rearrested more than juveniles who were referred to the Family Court between the ages 14-17 (X^2=.78829; p=.06743).

Table 4

ARREST RECIDIVISM BY GROUPED AGE

Arrest-Recidivism	Grouped Age: Unknown n	Unknown %	7-13 n	7-13 %	14-17 n	14-17 %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	2	100.0	114	74.0	123	72.8	239	73.5
No	-	-	40	26.0	46	27.2	86	26.5
Column Total	2	.6	154	47.4	169	52.0	325	100.0

The results for recidivism by conviction (Table 5) was quite similar in that 51.9% (n=80) of the juveniles who were first referred to the Family Court between the ages of 7-13 years of age recidivated while 48.1% (n=74) in this age category did not. For the 14-17 age category when first referred 50.3% (n=85) recidivated and 49.7% (n=84) did not (X^2=1.99198; p=0.3694).

Table 5

CONVICTION RECIDIVISM BY GROUPED AGE

Conviction-Recidivism	Grouped Age: Unknown n	Unknown %	7-13 n	7-13 %	14-17 n	14-17 %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	2	100.0	80	51.9	85	50.3	167	51.4
No	-	-	74	48.1	84	49.7	158	48.6
Column Total	2	.6	154	47.4	169	52.0	325	100.0

Out of a total of 325 juveniles, 266 or 81.8% were referred to community agencies for specialized treatment prior to HYCF commitment while 18.2% (n=59) were not (Table 6). Of those referred, 24.0% (n=78) were placed in one program prior to HYCF, 23.4% (n=76) had 2 placements, 13.2% (n=43) had 3 placements and 21.2% (n=69) were placed in 4 or more programs. Of those juveniles who had no prior placements 72.9% (n=43) recidivated. The juveniles with just one prior placement recidivated at the highest recidivism-arrest level, 78.2% (n=61). Those with 3 prior placements recidivated at the 73.7% (n=56) level, while 69.6% (n=48) of the juveniles who had 4 or more placements recidivated by arrest. The data indicate that there is no real difference in an individual's chances of rearrest despite the number of programs he/she was placed in (X^2=1.49279; p=.8279).

It is interesting to note, in Table 7, that though 51.4% (n=167) were reconvicted and 48.6% (n=158) were not, the total number of placements utilized by a juvenile has had an undetermined effect in reducing rates of reconviction. For example, of the 18.2% (n=59) that had no placements, 52.5% (n=31) were not reconvicted. This seems to hold true for the data displayed for those who utilized two (52.6% or n=40) and four or more (50.0% or n=35) placements. Yet for the individual who utilized one (59.0% or n=46), and three (53.0% or n=23) placements, the data suggests that reconviction is greater (X^2=2.85265; p=.5828).

Table 6

ARREST RECIDIVISM BY TOTAL NUMBER OF PLACEMENTS

Arrest Recidivism	Total Number of Placements: 0 n	0 %	1 n	1 %	2 n	2 %	3 n	3 %	4 or more n	4 or more %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	43	72.9	61	78.2	56	73.7	31	72.1	48	69.6	239	73.5
No	16	27.1	17	21.8	20	26.3	12	27.9	21	30.4	86	26.5
Column Total	59	18.2	78	24.0	76	23.4	43	13.2	69	21.2	325	100.0

16

Table 7

CONVICTION RECIDIVISM BY TOTAL NUMBER OF PLACEMENTS

Conviction-Recidivism	Total Number of Placements: 0 n	0 %	1 n	1 %	2 n	2 %	3 n	3 %	4 or more n	4 or more %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	28	47.5	46	59.0	36	47.4	23	53.5	34	49.3	167	51.4
No	31	52.5	32	41.0	40	52.6	20	46.5	35	50.7	158	48.6
Column Total	59	18.2	78	24.0	76	23.4	43	13.2	69	21.2	325	100.0

The variable of placements utilized by the juvenile prior to his/her commitment to HYCF was broken down into five major categories. A total of 82 different placement resources that were found to have been utilized by the juveniles were subsumed under one of the five major categories. The categories included: 1) residential, 2) educational, 3) mental health, 4) extension, and 5) other. A brief description of each category is as follows:

Residential

Placements which involved a 24-hour service to the juvenile who resided outside of the home. The residential placement may have been of a short-term or long-term nature. The placement may have included comprehensive services offered such as counselling and educational programs (an example would be the Salvation Army Residential Treatment Facility for Children and Youth) or simply offered basic custodial care such as foster homes. The Detention Home was not included in this category.

Educational

Educational placements included services that were primarily aimed at addressing the juvenile's educational needs. Placements such as the Storefront program and the Hale O'Ulu program fell under this category.

Mental Health

Mental health placements described treatment services provided to the juveniles which involved a focus on therapeutic issues. Such therapeutic activities involving individual, family and group therapy were included under this category. Mental health centers and private therapists were two examples of this type of placement service.

Extension

The extension placements involved programs which provided more normal, supportive and social type of activities for the juveniles. Programs such as Big Brothers and the Alternatives for Youth (mini biking) were listed in this category.

Other

Placements that did not fall under any of the above categories were listed under the "other" category. An example of this was the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act program which involved employment training.

Data was collected for each juvenile's placement utilization prior to HYCF commitment. For feasibility purposes, only the last three placements used were identified by name and subsumed under the five categories. If the juvenile had utilized four or more placement services, this was also noted.

In analyzing the placement data, it should be kept in mind that a juvenile may have utilized only one type of placement or may have utilized several different placements falling under different categories. As an example, a juvenile's placements utilization could have been represented under the educational, mental health and extension categories respectively if the juvenile had indeed used the three different types of placements prior to HYCF commitment. Caution should thus be exercised in analyzing and making interpretations about relationships existing between the recidivism data and the placement variable.

Residential Placement

A total of 179 out of 325 or 55.1% of the juveniles were placed in a residential program and 44.9% (n=146) were not (Table

8). Of the 55.1% of the juveniles who had a residential placement, 69.8% (n=125) were rearrested while 30.2% (n=54) were not. For 44.9% of the minors that were not placed in a residential placement, 78.1% (n=114) were rearrested and 21.9% (n=32) did not get rearrested. It is intriguing to note that the large majority of the sample could be found in the arrest recidivism bracket whereas a proportionately lower number displayed itself in the no arrest recidivism bracket. No residential placement/arrest had the highest occurrence in terms of percentage while no residential placement/no arrest had the lowest (X^2=2.40444; p=.1210).

Table 8

ARREST RECIDIVISM BY RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT

	Placed in a Residential Program					
	Yes		No		Row Total	
Arrest-Recidivism	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	125	69.8	114	78.1	239	73.5
No	54	30.2	32	21.9	86	26.5
Column Total	179	55.1	146	44.9	325	100.0

Table 9 illustrates that out of the 55.1% (n=179) of the juveniles who were placed in a residential type facility, 46.9% (n=84) were convicted again while 53.1% (n=95) did not recidivate. Conversely, of the 44.9% (n=146) who were not placed at a residential facility, 56.8% (n=83) were convicted again whereas 43.2% (n=63) were not. The highest and lowest percentages appeared in

the no residential placement column for both conviction and no conviction, respectively (X^2=2.78417, p=.0952).

Table 9

CONVICTION RECIDIVISM BY RESIDENTIAL PLACEMENT

	Placed in a Residential Program					
	Yes		No		Row Total	
Conviction-Recidivism	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	84	46.9	83	56.8	167	51.4
No	95	53.1	63	43.2	158	48.6
Column Total	179	55.1	146	44.9	325	100.0

Educational Placement

Although of 112 or 34.5% of the juveniles were placed in educational programs and 65.5% (n=213) were not (Table 10). Of the 34.5% of the juveniles placed in such programs, 77.7% (n=87) recidivated by arrest while 22.3% (n=25) did not. Of the juveniles who did not have an educational placement 71.4% (n=152) were rearrested and 28.6% (n=61) of those juveniles without an educational placement did not recidivate. The data suggests that the higher percentage of recidivists were in the educational placement/arrest category whereas the low were in the educational placement/no arrest category (X^2=1.19815, p=.2737).

Table 10

ARREST RECIDIVISM BY EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENT

Arrest-Recidivism	Placed in an Educational Program: Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	87	77.7	152	71.4	239	73.5
No	25	22.3	61	28.6	86	26.5
Column Total	112	34.5	213	65.5	325	100.0

In viewing the cross-tabulation of educational placements and conviction recidivism, Table 11 indicates that of the 34.5% (n=112) of the subjects placed in an educational setting, 56.3% (n=63) were reconvicted while 43.8% (n=49) remained conviction free. The effect of being situated in any kind of educational environment suggests that 48.8% (n=104) of the youngsters recidivated while 51.2% (n=109) did not, out of a sample of 65.5% (n=213). The highest percentage, not necessarily the most individuals present, was conviction/educational placement while the lowest percentage was no conviction/educational placement (X^2=1.33584, p=.2478).

Table 11

CONVICTION RECIDIVISM BY EDUCATIONAL PLACEMENT

	Placed in an Educational Program					
	Yes		No		Row Total	
Conviction-Recidivism	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	63	56.3	104	48.8	167	51.4
No	49	43.8	109	51.2	158	48.6
Column Total	112	34.5	213	65.5	325	100.0

Mental Health Placement

Twenty-eight percent (n=91) of the population received treatment in a mental health program and 72.0% (n=234) did not (Table 12). Of the 28.0% (n=91) that received mental health treatment, 72.5% (n=66) were rearrested while 27.5% were not. Similar proportions of rearrest were recorded for the 72.0% who did not receive treatment in a mental health program. For these individuals 73.9% (n=173) were rearrested and 26.1% were not. The data suggests that whether or not a juvenile was placed in a mental health program has no effect on reducing high rates of recidivism-arrest (X^2=0.01384, p=0.9064).

Table 12

ARREST RECIDIVISM BY MENTAL HEALTH PLACEMENT

Arrest-Recividism	Placed in a Mental Health Program: Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	66	72.5	173	73.9	239	73.5
No	25	27.5	61	26.1	86	26.5
Column Total	91	28.0	234	72.0	325	100.0

When the criterion of conviction was applied, 61.5% (n=56) recidivated and 38.5% (n=35) did not (Table 13). In contrast, having a much larger sample of the total population, 72.0% (n=234) of the adolescents did not receive any specific mental health intervention. Of the 72.0%, 47.4% (n=111) were convicted again whereas 52.6% (n=123) were not. In summation, the highest and lowest percentages, interestingly, arose in the conviction/mental health placement and the no conviction/mental health placement (X^2=.4.66705, p=<.05).

Table 13

CONVICTION RECIDIVISM BY MENTAL HEALTH PLACEMENT

Conviction-Recidivism	Placed in a Mental Health Program: Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	56	61.5	111	47.4	167	51.4
No	35	38.5	123	52.6	158	48.6
Column Total	91	28.0	234	72.0	325	100.0

Extension Placement

A total of 45 out of 325 or 13.8% of the juveniles were placed in an extension placement while 86.2% (n=280) had no such placement (Table 14). Of those juveniles who had an extension placement, 80.0% (n=36) recidivated at the arrest level while 20.0% (n=9) did not recidivate. For the juveniles who did not have an extension placement, 72.5% (n=263) recidivated at the arrest level and 27.5% (n=77) did not. The highest rate of recidivism by arrest, 80.0% (n=36) was revealed for those juveniles who had been placed in an extension program while the lowest rate, 27.5% (n=77), occurred for the juveniles who had no extension placement (X^2=.76840, p=.3807).

Table 14

ARREST RECIDIVISM BY EXTENSION PLACEMENT

	Placed in an Extension Program					
	Yes		No		Row Total	
Arrest-Recidivism	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	36	80.0	203	72.5	239	73.5
No	9	20.0	77	27.5	86	26.5
Column Total	45	13.8	280	86.2	325	100.0

Table 15 indicates that of the 13.8% (n=45 of 325) of the youths who did participate in an extension program, 53.3% (n=24) of them recidivated at the conviction level while 46.7% (n=21) did not. The 86.2% (n=280) who did not have any contact or

experience with an extension placement constituted the majority of the sample. Statistically, of the 86.2% of the minors, 51.1% (n=143) were convicted again, and similarly, 48.9% (n=137) were not. The highest percentage were in the conviction/extension placement group and the lowest percentage, in the no conviction/extension placement (X^2=.01467, p=.9036).

Table 15

CONVICTION RECIDIVISM BY EXTENSION PLACEMENT

	Placed in an Extension Program					
	Yes		No		Row Total	
Conviction-Recidivism	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	24	53.3	143	51.1	167	51.4
No	21	46.7	137	48.9	158	48.6
Column Total	45	13.8	280	86.2	325	100.0

Other Placement

A total of 25 out 325 or 7.7% (n=25 of 325) of the juveniles were referred to "other" agencies as a means of intervention, whereas 92.3% (n=300 of 325) did not (Table 16). Of the 7.7%, 72.0% recidivated at the arrest level and 28.0% (n=7) did not. For the 92.3% who did not use such placements, 73.7% (n=221) were rearrested, while conversely, 26.3% (n=79) were not. Having no other placements, coupled with being rearrested, produced the highest percentage ranking of the sample in question. On the opposite end of the continuum was the no other placement/no arrest recidivism category (X^2=0.0, p=1.00).

Table 16

ARREST RECIDIVISM BY OTHER PLACEMENTS

Arrest-Recidivism	Placed in Other Placements: Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	18	72.0	221	73.7	239	73.5
No	7	28.0	79	26.3	86	26.5
Column Total	25	7.7	300	92.3	325	100.0

The low number of 7.7% (n=25), who were categorized in the "other" placement group, had almost identical numbers of individuals represented in both the conviction (52.0%, n=13) and no conviction (48.0%, n=12) categories (Table 17). The "no other placement" group, 51.3% (n=154) recidivated at the conviction level while 48.7% (n=146) did not. Having noted the disparity in the two columns as a precautionary note, the highest and lowest percentages can be singled out. The high and low, with reservations, are conviction/other placement and no conviction/other placement, respectively (X^2=0.0, p=1.0).

Table 17

CONVICTION RECIDIVISM BY OTHER PLACEMENT

Conviction-Recidivism	Other Placements: Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	13	52.0	154	51.3	167	51.4
No	12	48.0	146	48.7	158	48.6
Column Total	25	7.7	300	92.3	325	100.0

Top Five Placement Referrals

The five most frequently utilized placements prior to HYCF commitment were categorized together as one variable. The five placements were: foster home, mental health center, the Salvation Army Residential Treatment Facility for Children and Youth, special motivation programs, and the Palama Settlement In-Community Treatment Program. The recidivism data was cross-tabulated with this variable to produce the following tables.

Of the 325 juveniles in this sample, 56.3% (n=183) were placed in at least one of the five most frequently utilized placements prior to HYCF commitment while 43.7% (n=142) were not (Table 18). Of this number, 71.6% (n=131) recidivated at the arrest level compared to 28.4% (n=52) who did not. As for those who were not placed in the top five placements, 76.1% (n=108) were rearrested as opposed to 23.9% (n=34) who were not (see Table 18) (X^2=.60787, p=.4356).

Table 18

ARREST RECIDIVISM BY TOP FIVE PLACEMENT REFERRALS

	Placed in Top Five Placement Referrals					
	Yes		No		Row Total	
Arrest-Recidivism	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	131	71.6	108	76.1	239	73.5
No	52	28.4	34	23.9	86	26.5
Column Total	183	56.3	142	43.7	325	100.0

The data show (Table 19) that of the 56.3% (n=183) of the juveniles who were placed in a residential program, 49.2% recidivated by conviction while 50.8% (n=93) did not. Of the 43.7% (n=142) who did not utilize any of the five most frequently used placements, 54.2% (n=77) did recidivate at the conviction level while 45.8% (n=65) did not recidivate (X^2=.62522; p=.4291).

Table 19

CONVICTION RECIDIVISM BY TOP FIVE PLACEMENT REFERRALS

	Top Five Placement Referrals					
	Yes		No		Row Total	
Conviction-Recidivism	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	90	49.2	77	54.2	167	51.4
No	93	50.8	65	45.8	158	48.6
Column Total	183	56.3	142	43.7	325	100.0

Placements in Detention Home Prior to HYCF Incarceration

Table 20 indicates that of the 325 individuals, 86.8% (n=282) spent some time in the Detention Home prior to HYCF commitment and 12.9% (n=42) did not. Of the juveniles who were placed in DH 73.8% (n=208) were rearrested while 26.2% (n=74) of those spending time in DH were not rearrested. For the 12.9% (n=42) of the juveniles who did not spend any time in DH, 73.8% (n=31) recidivated while 26.2% (n=11) did not. It is interesting to note that the percentage for DH placement/arrest and no DH placement/arrest remained consistently the same (73.8%) while DH placement/no

arrest and no DH placement/no arrest followed the same pattern (26.2%) (X^2=2.7877, p=.2481).

Table 20

ARREST RECIDIVISM BY PLACEMENT IN DETENTION HOME PRIOR TO HYCF

	Placed in Detention Home Prior to HYCF							
	Unknown		Yes		No		Row Total	
Arrest-Recidivism	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes			208	73.8	31	73.8	239	73.5
No	1	100.0	74	26.2	11	26.2	86	26.5
Column Total	1	.3	282	86.8	42	12.9	325	100.0

In conviction recidivism, of the 86.8% (n=282) who were placed in Detention Home, 51.8% (n=146) recidivated while 48.2% (n=136) did not (Table 21). On the other hand, those juveniles who had no DH placement had equal percentages (50.0%) and a equal number of subjects (n=21) in both the recidivism and no recidivism categories. It was extraordinary to learn that of all four categories in question all four showed a relatively equal distribution in percentages. However, only the n's in the DH/conviction and DH/no conviction remained well balanced. Likewise, the no DH/conviction and no DH/no conviction sets had matched numbers (X^2=1.10623, p=.5752).

Table 21

CONVICTION RECIDIVISM BY PLACEMENT
IN DETENTION HOME PRIOR TO HYCF

	Placed in Detention Home Prior to HYCF							
	Unknown		Yes		No		Row Total	
Conviction-Recidivism	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes			146	51.8	21	50.0	167	51.4
No	1	100.0	136	48.2	21	50.0	158	48.6
Column Total	1	.3	282	86.8	42	12.9	325	100.0

Offense Severity

Data was collected on each individuals' last five offenses, prior to their first HYCF incarceration period. Each offense was categorized using the Hawaii Penal Code. Offenses were grouped into the following severity classifications: felony A's, felony B's, felony C's, misdemeanors, and petty misdemeanors. In tables 22a-22e the various offense severities are crossed against recidivism. Across the tables a participant may be represented in more than one severity table. For example, an individual who committed a felony A, would be represented in Table 22a, if he also committed a misdemeanor he would be represented in Table 22d depending severity of each of the five offenses. An individual committing only one felony or five felony A's would be represented in the felony A table as a single count. These severity categories will be cross tabulated across recidivism by arrest (tables 22a-22e) and redicivism by conviction (tables 23a-23e).

In Table 22(a-e) individuals who committed felony A offenses had the highest arrest recidivism, 79.3%, followed by 77.5% of

the petty misdemeanor group who recidivated. In general the recidivism rate of the people who committed any of the severity levels ranged between 72.5% to 79.3%. No significant differences can be detected when examining arrest recidivism in relationship to committing an offense or not.

In Table 23(a-e) severity levels by conviction recidivism shows that 58.7% of the individuals who committed petty misdemeanors had subsequent convictions. This was followed by 56.4% of the people who committed felony B offenses, who recidivated. In general the recidivism by conviction for those who committed the various offenses ranged from 44.8% to 58.7%, compared to 46.0% to 54.1% for those who recidivated not having committed the specified offense type. No major differences are evident between the two groups.

Table 22 (a-e)

OFFENSE SEVERITY PRIOR TO ENTRY HYCF
BY ARREST RECIDIVISM

Felony A

Recidivism	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	23	79.3	216	73.0	239	73.5
No	6	20.7	80	27.0	86	26.5
Column Total	29	8.9	296	91.1	325	100.0

Felony B

Recidivism	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	108	77.1	131	70.8	239	73.5
No	32	22.9	54	29.2	86	26.5
Column Total	140	43.1	185	56.9	325	100.0

Table 22 (continued)

Felony C

Recidivism	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	119	75.3	120	71.9	239	73.5
No	39	24.7	47	28.1	86	26.5
Column Total	167	51.4	158	48.6	325	100.0

Misdemeanor

Recidivism	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	87	72.5	152	74.1	239	73.5
No	33	27.5	53	25.9	86	26.5
Column Total	205	63.1	120	36.9	325	100.0

Petty Misdemeanor

Recidivism	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	107	77.5	132	70.6	239	73.5
No	31	22.5	55	29.4	86	26.5
Column Total	187	57.5	138	42.5	325	100.0

Table 23(a-e)

OFFENSE SEVERITY PRIOR TO ENTRY HYCF
BY CONVICTION RECIDIVISM

Felony A

Recidivism	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	13	44.8	154	52.0	167	51.4
No	16	55.2	142	48.0	158	48.6
Column Total	29	8.9	296	91.1	325	100.0

Table 23 (continued)

Felony B

Recidivism	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	79	56.4	88	47.6	167	51.4
No	61	43.6	97	52.4	158	48.6
Column Total	140	43.1	185	56.9	325	100.0

Felony C

Recidivism	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	83	52.5	84	53.3	167	51.4
No	75	47.5	83	49.7	158	48.6
Column Total	158	48.6	167	51.4	325	100.0

Misdemeanor

Recidivism	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	56	46.7	111	54.1	167	51.4
No	64	53.3	94	45.9	158	48.6
Column Total	120	36.9	205	63.9	325	100.0

Petty Misdemeanor

Recidivism	Yes n	Yes %	No n	No %	Row Total n	Row Total %
Yes	81	58.7	86	46.0	167	51.4
No	57	41.3	101	54.0	158	48.6
Column Total	138	42.5	187	57.5	325	100.0

DISCUSSION

The sample (325 individuals out of 570) was examined at two levels of recidivism - arrest and conviction. Although recidivism for the population and the sub-sample were similar, the sub-sample's percentage for recidivism by arrest was 73.5% (n=239) and recidivism by conviction was at 51.4% (n=167). These figures were close to the 1984 study's percentages of 74.9% (n=427) and 53.7% (n=306), respectively.

Among the variables that were cross-tabulated with the original population's recidivism data, only the mental health placement at the conviction recidivism level proved to be significant. A juvenile's placement in a mental health program displayed a high rate of recidivism by conviction. The data suggests that juveniles who were not placed in a mental health program recidivated much less than those who were. A possible explanation for this difference may stem from the fact that juveniles placed in such programs have been perceived to have a higher degree of mental dysfunction or sociopathic behavior, therefore having higher chances of violating the law again.

Past literature on juvenile delinquency presents age at first referral to Family Court as being related to increased recidivism, the findings of this study reveal no significant relationship. A possible explanation for this occurrence might be that the subjects of this study were of a restricted population (i.e., incarcerated at HYCF). Past research may not be applicable to the subjects of this study. The lack of a significant relationship between the age variable and recidivism might also be explained by the procedure

used in grouping of ages. Since the data collected for the age at first referral was categorized into two groups (7-13 years; 14-17 years), the restricted range (either young or old) did not make use of the full range of ages consequently, relationships may have been lost in the method that age was categorized.

In addressing the question of whether there exists any relationship between the total number of placements and recidivism, the findings of this study indicated that the total number of placements utilized prior to HYCF commitment has no bearing on recidivism. The recidivism percentages remained relatively constant regardless of the number of placements utilized at both the arrest and conviction recidivism.

There was also no significant relationship found in the types of placements utilized by the juvenile prior to HYCF commitment except for those in mental health placements for recidivism convictions. Similar to the number of placements utilized, recidivism across the types of placements did not vary by more than 10.2% (69.8% - 80.0%) for the recidivist by arrest group. For recidivism by conviction, recidivism ranged from 46.9% to 61.5%, revealing a difference of 14.6 percentage points.

A significant relationship was not found in the top five most utilized placements prior to HYCF on recidivism. This raises the question of the effectiveness of such placements presently utilized since placement were not related to recidivism for this "hard core" population.

The detainment in DH prior to HYCF commitment revealed no significant relationship in predicting recidivism. The percentage of individuals that were detained and those who were not detained

were exactly the same in arrest recidivism. This effect can be similarly viewed in recidivism by conviction where the difference was 1.8%. Contrary to past research, this study found that placement in the detention home does not contribute or stem future recidivism.

No significant relationship was found when examining offense severity and recidivism. The severity level of the offense explain recidivism.

Limitations/Problems

Many problems were encountered during this study. One of the problems faced by the researchers arose in the way some of the programs overlapped. Example: Salvation Army, which was ranked as one of the five most utilized placements, was classified as residential treatment in this study. However, this agency could also have been placed in the educational or mental health category. The researchers realize that all aspects of this agency are essential for the welfare of the minor, but each individual is placed there for certain services. This pertained to programs such as the YMCA's, hospital programs, and Palama Settlement.

Another problem was addressed in the discovery that a few programs were short lived, absolved by other programs or modified. Therefore, the program's purpose could not be determined.

Implications

Tighter operational definitions and clearer delineations between program placements would greatly enhance further study in this area. The possibility of utilizing all the placements that

every individual used prior to incarceration, rather than the last three used, could also facilitate further endeavors but also complicate it more.

Although the five highest frequency placements were analyzed the researchers felt that the use of ten highest frequency placements could have made for a much more diverse and relevant information.

In regards to the variable of DH it is speculated that exploring the total number of times retained and length of time detained would prove relevant. The notion is that younger age placements and the duration of stay in DH is related to recidivism.

The focus of this study was on a specialized population of juveniles, those who had been incarcerated at HYCF, for a period during their adolescent years. The lack of significant relationships between the various variables and recidivism was not surprising. The researchers were aware of the fact that other extraneous variables and factors may have influenced the variable-recidivism relationships under study. The nature of the sample, which could be considered "hard core" seems to be a major factor affecting the results.

REFERENCES

Bartell, T. & Winfree, L. T. Jr. Recidivist impacts of differential sentencing practice for burglar offenders. Criminology, 1977, 15, pp. 387-395.

Heilbrun, A. B., Knopf, I. J., & Bruner, P. Criminal impulsivity and violence and subsequent parole outcome. British Journal of Criminology, 1967, 16, 367-377.

Hernandez, F. & Sakamoto, L. Recidivism: A study of the 1974 adult probation population. Youth Development and Research Center, School of Social Work, University of Hawaii at Manoa, 1982, Report No. 280.

Keala, F. The repeat offender syndrome. Research and Development Division, Honolulu Police Department, Final Report, 1974.

LeClair, D. P. An analysis of recidivism rates among residents released from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions during the year 1973. Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1976.

Lewis, M. Children in need of supervision. Juvenile Justice Judicial Project, University of Alabama, July 1979.

Ling, K. Problems grow despite reforms. Honolulu Star-Bulletin, August 4, 1981, A-1.

Mahoney. The effect of labeling upon youths in the juvenile justice system: A review of evidence. Law and Society Review, 1974, 583.

Martin, L. H. & Snyder, P. R. Jurisdiction of status offenders should not be removed from the juvenile court. Crime and Delinquency, 1976, 22, pp. 44-47.

Menard, S. & Covey, H. Community alternatives and rearrest in Colorado. Criminal Justice and Behavior, October 1983, pp. 93-108.

Mitchell, S. & Rosa, P. Boyhood behavior problems as precursors of criminality: A fifteen-year follow-up study. Journal of Child Psychology and Allied Disciplines, January 1981, 22, pp. 19-33.

Nacci, P. The importance of recidivism: Reasearch in understanding criminal behavior. Journal of Criminal Justice, Fall 1978, 6, pp. 253-259.

Nelson, G. M. Services to status offenders and delinquents under title XX. Social Work, National Association of Social Workers Inc., July 1982, pp. 348-353.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention / Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice. National evaluation design for the deinstitutionalization of status offender programs. Developed by the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offender Evaluation Project Staff, Social Science Research Institute, University of Southern California, Washington D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Stott, D. H. & Wilson, D. M. The adult criminal as juvenile. British Journal of Criminology, 1977, 17, pp. 47-57.

Tangonan, R. A study on the relationships and predictive value of the DAGP recemmendations of the probation officer and actual court dispositions and subsequent outcome for the period 1971-1973. Upublished manuscript. Sociology Department, University of Hawaii at Manoa, 1977.

Waldo, G. P., Chiricos, T. G., & Dobrin, L. E. Community contact and inmate attitudes: An experimental assessment of work release. Criminology, 11, 1973, pp.345-381.

Zych, P. Recidivism of dischargees from the Hawaii youth correctional facility - 1974-1978. Unpublished Manuscript. Youth Development and Research Center, School of Social Work, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT

1. Name: _____

2. Project I.D.#: _____ 1 2 3

3. Family Court I.D.#: _____ 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

4. Age at first referral to Family Court: ____ 11 12

5. Placements utilized? 13

   Yes ____

   No ____

6. Last 3 placements utilized prior to HYCF commitment?

   1) _____ 14 15

   2) _____ 16 17

   3) _____ 18 19

7. Four or more placements utilized? 20

   Yes ____

   No ____

8. Total number of months on probation: ____ 21 22

9. Total number of times on probation: _____ 23

10. Detained in the detention home? 24

    Yes ____

    No ____

APPENDIX A-1

11. Last 5 offenses prior to HYCF commitment

1) _____ 25

2) _____ 26

3) _____ 27

4) _____ 28

5) _____ 29

12. Total mumber of referrals: ____ 30 31

13. Total mumber of times placed in HYCF: ____ 32

14. HYCF I.D.#: _____ 33 34 35 36 37 38

Code Sheets

Item	Column	
Project ID #	1-3	
Family Court ID #	4-10	
Age at Family Court Referral	11-12	
Placement at various agencies	13	yes/no
1st placement prior to incarceration	14-15	
2nd placement prior to incarceration	16-17	
3rd placement prior to incarceration	18-19	
4 or more placements	20	yes/no
Total # of months on probation	21-22	
Total # of times on probation	23	
Placement at DH prior to incarceration	24	yes/no
1st offense	25	
2nd offense	26	
3rd offense	27	
4th offense	28	
5th offense	29	
Total # of offenses	30-31	
Total # of times incarcerated at HYCF	32	
HYCF Id #	33-38	

APPENDIX B-1

Code	Offense
1	Felony A (FA)
2	Felony B (FB)
3	Felony C (FC)
4	Misdemeanor (M)
5	Petty Misdemeanor (PM)
6	Status Offense (PINS)
7	Probation Violation (PV)
8	Law Violation (LV)
9	Unknown

CODE	for	YES & NO items
1	=	Yes
2	=	No

CODE	PLACEMENTS
01	Adult Education Program
02	Alcohol Treatment Facility (ATF)
03	Alternatives For Youth (Mini-bike Program)
04	Big Brothers
05	Buddy System
06	Catholic Social Service (CSS)
07	CETA Program
08	Child and Family Service
09	Children's Hospital-Child Guidance Clinic
10	Community Quest Program
11	Dole Intermediate Group Therapy
12	Drop-out Program
13	Emergency Shelter Home
14	Employability Program
15	Easter Seals-Sultan School
16	Family Court Mental Health Team
17	Family Life Center
18	Foster Home
19	Group Home
20	Habilitat
21	Hale Kipa
22	Hale Ho'opono
23	Hale Ohana
24	Hale O'Maluhia
25	Hale O'ulu
26	Hawaiian Heritage Project
27	Hawaii Bound

APPENDIX B-3

28	Hawaii School for the Deaf and Blind
29	Hawaii State Hospital-Adolescent Unit
30	Honolulu Community College-Family Counseling
31	Honolulu Job Resource Center For Youth
32	Intensive Intervention Project
33	Job Corps
34	Kahaluu Key Project
35	Kaimuki Work Experience
36	Kalakaua Extended Project
37	Kalihi Palama Ed Center
38	Kalima O'Maui
39	Kamehameha School Work Beach Camp Program
40	Kamuela Work Camp
41	Kapahulu Child Training Project
42	Kaulana Hana Hou
43	Lanakila School Special Program
44	Leahi Hospital
45	Liliuokalani Trust (LT)
46	Mental Health Centers
47	Na Opio
48	NYC Program
49	Ohana Group
50	Olomana School Group Therapy
51	Olomana Youth Center
52	Palama GGI
53	Palama Group Home
54	Palama Learning Center
55	Palama Settlement In Community Treatment Program

56 Palama Uka-Kam School Camp

57 Private Mental Health Services

58 Queen's Hospital Mental Health

59 Reynolds Army Hospital

60 Salvation Army Residential Treatment Facility For Children and Youths (SARTFCY)

61 Schofield Family Life Center

62 Special Motivation Programs (SMP)

63 Special Education Programs

64 Storefront

65 Teen Challenge

66 TOPS

67 Tripler Medical Center

68 Volunteers In Public Service (VIPS)

69 Waianae Rap Center

70 Waimano Home

71 Wahi O'Maluhia

72 William Beaumont General Hospital

73 WIN

74 YMCA

75 Hale Opio

76 YWCA

77 CPS

78 Kahaluu Canteen Project

79 Barbers Point Emotionally Disturbed Class

80 Learning Station

81 Alternative Tutoring Program

82 Quick Kokua

APPENDIX B-5

CATEGORIZATION OF INDIVIDUAL AGENCIES

Residential Placements

1. Alcohol Treatment Facility (ATF)
2. Emergency Shelter Home
3. Foster Home
4. Group Home
5. Habilitat
6. Hale Kipa
7. Hale Opio
8. Hawaii State Hospital-Adolescent Unit
9. Job Corps
10. Leahi Hospital
11. Palama Group Home
12. Palama Settlement In Community Treatment Program
13. Salvation Army Residential Treatment Facility for Children and Youth
14. Teen Challenge
15. Waimano Home

Educational Placements

1. Adult Education Program
2. Alternative Tutoring Program
3. Dole Intermediate Group Therapy
4. Drop-out Program
5. Easter Seals-Sultan School
6. Hale O'ulu
7. Hawaii School for the Deaf and Blind
8. Kahaluu Key Project
9. Kalakaua Extended Project

10. Kalihi Palama Ed Center
11. Lanakila School Special Program
12. Learning Station
13. Olomana Youth Center
14. Palama Learning Center
15. Special Motivation Programs (SMP)
16. Special Education Programs
17. Storefront
18. TOPS
19. Barbers Point Emotionally Disturbed Class

Mental Health Placements

1. Catholic Social Services
2. Child and Family Services
3. Children's Hospital-Child Guidance Clinic
4. Family Court Mental Health Team
5. Family Life Center
6. Honolulu Community College-Family Counseling
7. Liliuokalani Trust (LT)
8. Mental Health Centers
9. Olomana School Group Therapy
10. Palama Guided Group Interaction
11. Private Mental Health Services
12. Queen's Hospital Mental Health
13. Reynolds Army Hospital
14. Schofield Family Life Center
15. Tripler Medical Center
16. William Beaumont General Hospital

Extension Placements

APPENDIX B-7

1. Alternatives For Youth (Mini-bike Program)
2. Big Brothers
3. Buddy System
4. Community Quest Program
5. Hawaiian Heritage Project
6. Hawaii Bound
7. Intensive Intervention Project
8. Kahaluu Canteen Project
9. Kamehameha School Work Beach Camp Program
10. Kapahulu Child Training Project
11. Palama Uka-Kam School Camp
12. Quick Kokua
13. Volunteers In Public Service (VIPS)
14. Waianae Rap Center
15. WIN
16. YMCA
17. YWCA

Other Placements

1. CETA
2. CPS
3. Employability Program
4. Hale Ho'opono
5. Hale Ohana
6. Hale O'Maluhia
7. Honolulu Job Resource Center For Youths
8. Kaimuki Work Experience
9. Kalima O'Maui
10. Kamuela Work Camp

11. Kaulana Hana Hou
12. Na Opio
13. NYC Program
14. Ohana Group
15. Wahi O'Maluhia